INTERNET FORM NLRB-508 (2-08)

FORM EXEMPT UNDER 44 U.S.C UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

CHARGE AGAINST LA	OR ORGANIZATION
OR ITS A	GENTS

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE					
Date Filed					

INSTRUCTIONS: File an original with NLRB Regional Director for the	region in which the alleged u	nfair labor pra	ctice occurre	ed or is occurring.	
1. LABOR ORGANIZATION OR ITS	S AGENTS AGAINST WHICH	CHARGE IS	BROUGHT		
a. Name			b. Union Representative to contact		
District 1199J, NUHHCE, AFSCME, AFL-CIO			Arnold Shep Cohen, Atty		
		60 Park P	-	15	
		Newark, NJ 07102			
c. Address (Street, city, state, and ZIP code)		d. Tel. No. (973) 642-	-01561	e. Cell No.	
9-25 Alling Street, 3rd Floor		f. Fax No.		g. e-Mail	
Newark, NJ 07101		(973) 802-	1055	asc@oxfeldcohen.com	
h. The above-named organization(s) or its agents has (have) engaged subsection(s) (list subsections) 8(b)(1) and 8(b)(3) are unfair practices affecting commerce within the meaning of the Act and the Postal Reorganization Act.	of the Natio	nal Labor Rel	ations Act, a	ind these unfair labor practic	
2. Basis of the Charge (set forth a clear and concise statement of the	e facts constituting the alleged	d unfair labor p	ractices)		
During negotiations concluding on February 7, 2013, Lo	ocal 1199J violated its du	uty to barga	in in good	I faith under Section 8	
(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act by actions mo		- Ti			
to refusing to meet and confer at reasonable times as re					
refusing to move off it in any way; refusing to consider p	proposals to enhance pa	tient care a	nd the pa	tient experience at the	
hospital; and refusing to discuss, edit, amend or alter in	any way prior language	; bargaining	g to impas	se on illegal dues	
check-off provisions (requiring employees' social securi	ty number) and unlawful	union secu	rity claus	e requiring the firing of	
non-union members; refusing to either accept bonuses	up to 5% per year for ho	spital base	d goals o	r offering a	
counter-proposal to that offer; refusing to disclose past	practices but insisting th	ey be inclu	ded in the	contract; deliberately	
deceiving the membership with a ballot wherein a "yes"	was a vote against the	contract an	d "no" was	s a vote for it, then	
rigging the vote and refusing to allow members to vote a	again when they implore	d the union	to do so;	and Violated 8(b)(1) c	
the Act by threatening and coercing its own members, it	ncluding members of its	own barga	ining com	mittee. SEE	
ATTACHED RIDER					
3. Name of Employer		4a. Tel. No.		b. Cell No.	
Jersey City Medical Center		(201) 915-2000			
		c. Fax No.		d. e-Mail mcataudella@libertyhcs.org	
				modica do ma em port, modione, g	
5. Location of plant involved (street, city, state and ZIP code) 355 Grant Street		1		er representative to contact	
Jersey City, NJ 07034				of Human Resources	
7. Type of establishment (factory, mine, wholesaler, etc.)	ne, wholesaler, etc.) 8. Identify principal product or			r of workers employed	
HOSPITAL	Excellent Patient Care	or service	2000		
10. Full name of party filing charge Jersey City Medical Center		11a. Tel. No (201) 915-		b. Cell No.	
ociscy only intedical ocinion		c. Fax No.		d. e-Mail	
11. Address of party filing charge (street, city, state and ZIP code.)		(201) 309-2751		mcataudella@libertyl	
355 Grant Street, Jersey City, NJ 07034		(201) 000 2101			
12. DECLARATION			No.	240,4040	
I declare that I have read the above charge and that the statements therein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.			(813) 248-1818 Cell No.		
(signature of representative or person making charge) (Print/type		/)			
		Fax	Fax No. (912) 259 1772		
One Terms City Center Suite 2000		0.8/	(813) 258-1773		
One Tampa City Center, Suite 2880			orentyes	ssin@gmail.com	
Address Tampa, FL 33602	(date) 3-25-1	13			

RIDER ATTACHED TO JERSEY CITY MEDICAL CENTER CHARGES, FORM 508 VERSUS LOCAL 1199j

- 1. Local 1199J violated it's Section 8(b)(3) duty to meet and confer at reasonable times in good faith in an attempt to reach an agreement. Due to the enormous changes in the healthcare industry as a result of the Affordable Care Act, the Hospital tried for 3 months to meet with the union and the union refused until November, which left inadequate time to bargain before the contract expired on December 31st.
- 2. When the union finally met with the Hospital it presented a list of demands from which it never moved in almost 3 month of negotiations. It proposed changes without ever proposing language to implement the changes, including new job titles, weekend schedules and bi-lingual translator differentials.
- 3. It refused to consider, edit, amend, or even discuss proposals by the Employer to update or modernize the contract. It bargained to impasse over an illegal and unenforceable dues check off clause (requiring the employer to provide it the social security number of its members) and union security clause (requiring maintenance of membership language it knew was unenforceable and over-broad.)
- 4. The union sent a negotiator who conceded she did not have the authority to negotiate the contract.
- 5. The union then refused to negotiate over items it has an obligation to bargain over, including effects bargaining, unless the hospital resumed negotiations after a good faith impasse was reached. The union failed to move on any article over which it had communicated an intransigent position (impasse) and yet refused to bargain on any issue unless the Employer resumed bargaining on areas of impasse. By so doing the union refused to bargain on mandatory subjects of bargaining unless the Employer conceded on permissive subjects of bargaining.
- 6. The Union through its agents harassed, threatened and coerced its own members in the workplace and at a union meeting on or about February 11th and 12th and on or about March 4th.
- 7. The union harassed, threatened and coerced a member of its bargaining committee who said they would not strike on or about March 4th.
- 8. The Union conducted a vote on employer's premises in which a "yes" vote was a vote against the contract and a "no" was a vote for the contract. The union through its agent Grisel Lopez then announced to the hospital in a cell phone conversation with HR VP Mary Cataudella that the vote had been

- "unanimous" against ratification and for a strike, a fact which the union knew at that time not to be true. When challenged by its own members, the union refused to produce any evidence of the vote, or the vote count, and refused to conduct a re-vote despite petitioning by its own members to do so. This pattern of conduct evidences a clear intent to avoid reaching an agreement.
- 9. When the members tried to conduct their own vote and submit the results to the union, the union through its officers and agents, including Grisel Lopez, tried to stop them from voting, and threatened and coerced members who had the temerity to wanted their votes to be counted accurately.
- 10. A majority of members, and vast majority of those voting, voted to ratify the contract and accept a 2% lump sum bonus from the employer. The union was presented with the evidence of that vote but refused to accept it in contravention of its Section 301 Duty of Fair Representation of its members, but more particularly it's obligations under 8(d) and 8(b)(3) of the Act. The union has refused to sign what its members have authorized, in a written contract.
- 11. The union, through its agent Grisel Lopez, tried to negotiate provisions not discussed at the bargaining table, but mandatory subject of the bargaining, directly with the Dietary (Food Services) Director Bob Ashe, including topics such as the job titles, supervisors doing bargaining unit work and other topics that are mandatory subjects of bargaining. Those topics were not bargained as part of the negotiations, and no proposals were made by the union at the bargaining table. By so doing the union was trying to subvert the bargaining process and acting in bad faith.
- 12. The union, through its agent Grisel Lopez, has encouraged its members covered by a contract (nursing) and currently covered by a no strike clause to strike in support of members not covered by a contract at this time. In so doing, the union is encouraging members to breach the contract and compromise public safety. It has done so in furtherance of its strategy of bad faith bargaining, and refusal to sign an offer its members voted to accept. In so doing, it puts at risk its own members who would be conducting an illegal strike, putting their licenses at risk for the unlawful collective bargaining goals of a different bargaining unit.